

REMARKS

With this Amendment, Applicants add new claim 314. Therefore, claims 188-191 and 314 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

With this Amendment, claim 188 is amended, as shown. Claim 314 is added in order more fully to cover various aspects of Applicants' invention as disclosed in the specification. This amendment and new claim 314 are fully supported in the originally-filed specification at least in paragraph 00104.

Claims 188 and 189 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jain (U.S. Patent 6,515,257), James (U.S. Patent 5,463,200), and Loschner (6,989,546).

Claims 190 and 191 and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jain, James, Loschner, Tamaoki (JP 06-043505) and Somei (JP 2003-051142). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 188 recites: "independently *optically* focusing ones of said plurality of laser beams to different independently selectable locations, said independently focusing comprising moving at least one *optical* element, for focusing an *optical* beam, associated with one of the plurality of laser beams to be focused, without f-theta optical elements" (emphasis added). Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests this limitation. The Examiner relies on Loschner to teach this limitation. However, Loschner is directed to particle multibeam lithography. The elements of Loschner which provide independent direction of a number of beams are the deflection units 110 which are electrostatic multipoles, as discussed in the paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7 of Loschner. As described, these multipoles are

magnetic elements (for example multiple electrode arrangements, as discussed in col. 7, lines 5-7), *not optical elements*.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Loschner fails to teach or suggest the above-discussed limitation of claim 188, and further, that one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to apply the teachings of the Loschner reference to the optical requirements of an application such as recited in the claims of the present invention. Applicants also submit that none of Jain, James, Tamaoki and Somei remedy the discussed deficiencies in Loschner. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 188 is patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references and that claims 189-191 and 314 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 188.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 188-191 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 10/660,730

Q77482

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 22, 2007